REMARKS

This is in response to the Office Action dated September 7, 2007. Claims 1, 4, 8, 10, 12 and 14 are pending.

Subject matter of claims 2, 3 and 5 has essentially been added to claim 1, and subject matter of claims 9 and 11 has essentially been added to claim 8. Thus, it is respectfully requested that this amendment be entered.

Claim 1 stands rejected under Section 103 as being allegedly unpatentable over Ino in view of Shiba. This Section 103 rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 as amended is supported, for example and without limitation, by the Fourth Modification Example in the instant specification at page 38, line 24 to page 40, line 5, and Figs. 13, 15A and 15B.

According to claim 1, "*the connection switching circuit* changes a switching order of the *video signal lines to be connected to each of the output terminals of the video signal line driving circuit in accordance with a switching of the scanning signal line selected by the scanning signal line driving circuit.*" Thus, for instance, brightness irregularities in the displayed image may be suppressed or reduced (e.g., pg. 8, lines 8-12). Moreover, since each of the plurality of video signal line groups is made of a plurality of video signal lines that are spaced apart by an odd number of video signal lines, the voltage polarities of the video signal lines of the same group can be the same although AC driving is performed in which the voltage polarity of the driving signals is inverted at each video signal line. As a result, even when the switching order of the video signal lines to be connected to each of the output terminals is changed, the switching period of the voltage polarity of the video signals to be output from the video signal line driving circuit need not become any shorter. Thus, in certain example embodiments, brightness

irregularities in the displayed image can be reduced or suppressed without an increase in power consumption (e.g., pg. 8, lines 13-22).

The Office Action cites to col. 6, line 63 to col. 7, line 3 as Ino's alleged teaching as to old claim 3 (now in claim 1). Although the quote of col. 6, line 63 to col. 7, line 3 allegedly describes sequential turn-on of time-division switches 16-1, 16-4, 16-7, 16-2, 16-5, 16-8, 16-3, 16-6, 16-9, ... according to gate selection signal S1, S2 and S3 (see Figs. 4, 6), no mention or suggestion is made of changing of the order for switching the video signal lines to be connected to each of the output terminals of the video signal line driving circuit as required by claim 1. Citation to Shiba and Hebiguchi cannot cure this fundamental flaw of Ino. Thus, even the alleged combination (which applicant believes is incorrect in any event) fails to meet the invention of claim 1.

Claim 8 has been amended to essentially include subject matter of old claims 9 and 11. Claim 8 requires that "in the connection switching step, a switching order of the video signal lines to be connected to each of the output terminals of the video signal line driving circuit is changed in accordance with a switching of the scanning signal line selected in the scanning signal line driving step." Again, the cited art fails to disclose or suggest this subject matter either alone or in the alleged combination.

It is respectfully requested that all rejections be withdrawn. All claims are in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.

By: _____
Joseph A. Rhoa
Reg. No. 37,515

JAR:caj
901 North Glebe Road, 11th Floor
Arlington, VA 22203-1808
Telephone: (703) 816-4000
Facsimile: (703) 816-4100